arXiv:1406.5689v1 [math.GR] 22 Jun 2014

TARSKI NUMBERS OF GROUP ACTIONS

GILI GOLAN

Abstract. The Tarski number of a group action $G \curvearrowright X$ is the minimal number of pieces in a paradoxical decomposition of it. For any $k \geq 4$ we construct a faithful transitive action of a free group of rank $k-1$ with Tarski number k. Using similar techniques we construct a group action $G \curvearrowright X$ with Tarski number 6 such that the Tarski numbers of restrictions of this action to finite index subgroups of G are arbitrarily large.

1. Introduction

Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a group action. We will always assume that groups are acting from the right.

Definition 1.1. The group action $G \curvearrowright X$ admits a *paradoxical decomposition* if there exist positive integers m and n, disjoint subsets $P_1, \ldots, P_m, Q_1, \ldots, Q_n$ of X and subsets $S_1 = \{g_1, \ldots, g_m\}$, $S_2 = \{h_1, \ldots, h_n\}$ of G such that

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} P_i g_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} Q_j h_j. \tag{1.1}$$

The sets S_1, S_2 are called the *translating sets* of the paradoxical decomposition.

The minimal possible value of $m+n$ in a paradoxical decomposition of $G \curvearrowright X$ is called the *Tarski number* of the action and denoted by $\mathcal{T}(G \curvearrowright X)$. If G acts on itself by right multiplication, the Tarski number of the action is called the Tarski number of G and denoted by $\mathcal{T}(G)$.

Clearly, $m, n \geq 2$ in any paradoxical decomposition. Thus, the Tarski number of any group action cannot be smaller than 4. By a result of Dekker (see, for example, [7, Theorem 5.8.38]) the Tarski number of a group is 4 if and only if it contains non abelian free subgroups. Recent results about Tarski numbers of groups, show that there are groups with arbitrarily large Tarski numbers [6, 2]. In [2] groups with Tarski number 5 and groups with Tarski number 6 are constructed. Note, that no integer ≥ 7 is known to be the Tarski number of a group.

For group actions, the situation is much more clear.

Theorem 1. *Every integer $k \geq 4$ is the Tarski number of a faithful transitive action of a finitely generated free group.*

To our knowledge, prior to this paper no integer > 4 was known to be the Tarski number of a faithful action of a free group. For actions of non-free groups, the only numbers known to be Tarski numbers are $4, 5$ and 6 [2]. In connection with Theorem 1, we mention the result of Jónsson, characterizing group actions with Tarski number 4.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 43A07, 20F65, 05E18, 20F10.

Key words and phrases. Tarski number, paradoxical decomposition, amenability, Stallings cores, automata.

Theorem 1.2. [8, Theorem 4.8] *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a group action. Then $\mathcal{T}(G \curvearrowright X) = 4$ if and only if G has a non abelian free subgroup F such that the restriction of the action to F has cyclic point stabilizers.*

In particular, if F is a non abelian free group and the action $F \curvearrowright X$ has cyclic point stabilizers then $\mathcal{T}(F \curvearrowright X) = \mathcal{T}(F)$. Part (2) of the following theorem generalizes this observation. The theorem, is the group action analogue of parts (a) and (c) of [2, Theorem 1]. Parts (b) and (d) can be extended to group actions as well.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a group action.*

(1) *Let $H \leq G$ be a finite index subgroup and $H \curvearrowright X$ the action of G restricted to H. Then,*
$$\mathcal{T}(H \curvearrowright X) - 2 \leq [G : H](\mathcal{T}(G \curvearrowright X) - 2).$$
(2) *If $G \curvearrowright X$ has amenable point stabilizers then $\mathcal{T}(G \curvearrowright X) = \mathcal{T}(G)$.*

Proof. In part (2), using corollary 2.7 below, one can reduce the problem to actions of G on $G/\mathrm{Stab}_G(x)$. Then, following the argument of [2, Theorem 1(c)] yields the result. The proof of part (1) requires a modification of [2, Lemma 3.1(i)]. The definition of colored Cayley graphs from [2] extends naturally to the group action case. Using Corollary 2.7 and Lemma 2.3(2) below, one can reduce the problem to finding a spanning evenly colored k-subgraph of $Cay(H \curvearrowright H/\mathrm{Stab}_H(x), (S_1', S_2'))$, when a spanning evenly colored k-subgraph of $Cay(G \curvearrowright G/\mathrm{Stab}_H(x), (S_1, S_2))$ is known to exist. □

In [2] it is observed that there exists t such that the property of having Tarski number t is not invariant under quasi isometry. Indeed, a construction from [3] yields a non amenable group G with finite index subgroups with arbitrarily large Tarski numbers. The only estimate of the value of t bounds it from above by 10^{10^8}. We prove an analogue result for group actions with $t = 6$.

Theorem 2. *Let F be a free group of rank 3. There exists a faithful transitive action $F \curvearrowright X$ such that $\mathcal{T}(F \curvearrowright X) = 6$ and restrictions of the action to finite index subgroups of F have arbitrarily large Tarski numbers.*

Note that by Theorem 1.2, 6 cannot be replaced by 4 in Theorem 2. We don't know if it can be replaced by 5.

Organization. Section 2 contains background information about Tarski numbers of group actions. Section 3 contains preliminary information about subgroups of free groups and their Stallings cores. Section 4 contains the proof of Theorem 1 and Section 5 contains the proof of Theorem 2.

Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank Mikhail Ershov and Mark Sapir for useful discussions and comments on the text. Most of the research was done during the author's stay at Vanderbilt University and at the University of Virginia. She is grateful for the accommodations and hospitality.

2. Tarski numbers of group actions

Lemma 2.1. [8, Proposition 1.10] *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a free action. Then, if G has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets S_1, S_2, then X has a paradoxical decomposition with the same translating sets.*

Corollary 2.2. *If the free group $\langle x, y\rangle$ acts freely on X, then X has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets $\{1, x\}$ and $\{1, y\}$.*

Proof. The free group $\langle x, y\rangle$ has a paradoxical decomposition with these translating sets [8, Theorem 1.2]. □

Lemma 2.3. *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a group action.*

1. *If $H \leq G$ is a subgroup of G and $H \curvearrowright X$ is the action of G restricted to H then $\mathcal{T}(G \curvearrowright X) \leq \mathcal{T}(H \curvearrowright X)$.*
2. *Let $G \curvearrowright Y$ be another G-action and $f\colon X \to Y$ be a G-equivariant surjective map. If S_1, S_2 are translating sets of a paradoxical decomposition of $G \curvearrowright Y$ then they are also translating sets of a paradoxical decomposition of $G \curvearrowright X$.*

Proof. (1) Every paradoxical decomposition with translating elements from H is in particular a paradoxical decomposition with translating elements from G.

(2) Let $P_1, \dots, P_m, Q_1, \dots, Q_n \subseteq Y$ be a paradoxical decomposition of $G \curvearrowright Y$ with translating sets $S_1 = \{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ and $S_2 = \{h_1, \dots, h_n\}$. Then the inverse images $f^{-1}(P_1), \dots f^{-1}(P_m), f^{-1}(Q_1), \dots, f^{-1}(Q_n)$ form a paradoxical decomposition of $G \curvearrowright X$ with the same translating sets. □

Corollary 2.4. *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a transitive action and $x \in X$. Let $\mathrm{Stab}_G(x) = \{g \in G : xg = x\}$ be the stabilizer of x. Then $G \curvearrowright X$ has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets S_1, S_2 if and only if so does the action $G \curvearrowright G/\mathrm{Stab}_G(x)$, where $G/\mathrm{Stab}_G(x)$ is the set of right cosets.*

Proof. Let $H = \mathrm{Stab}_G(x)$. For every $y \in X$ there exists $g \in G$ such that $y = xg = xHg$. Sending y to Hg results in a G-equivariant isomorphism between X and the quotient set G/H. Thus Lemma 2.3(2) yields the result. □

Remark 2.5. Let $H \triangleleft G$ be a normal subgroup. Then if $G \curvearrowright G/H$ is paradoxical so is the group G/H.

Proof. Every translating element from G can be replaced by its image in G/H. □

Lemma 2.6. *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a group action.*

1. *Let $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$ be a partition of X in which every set is closed under the action of G. Then $G \curvearrowright X$ has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets S_1, S_2 if and only if for every α, the action $G \curvearrowright X_\alpha$ has a a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets S_1, S_2.*
2. *$G \curvearrowright X$ has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets S_1, S_2 if and only if the same is true for every orbit of the action.*

Proof. (2) follows from (1) by taking the partition of X to be the set of orbits of the action $G \curvearrowright X$.

(1) In the one direction, for each α, the intersection of the translated sets in a paradoxical decomposition of X with X_α forms a paradoxical decomposition of X_α with the same translating sets. In the other direction, assume that every X_α has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets $S_1 = \{g_1, \dots g_m\}$, $S_2 = \{h_1, \dots h_n\}$ and translated sets $P_1^\alpha, \dots P_m^\alpha, Q_1^\alpha \dots Q_n^\alpha$. Then, the unions $P_i = \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} P_i^\alpha$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $Q_j = \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} Q_j^\alpha$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$ form a paradoxical decomposition of X with translating sets S_1 and S_2. □

Combining Lemma 2.6(2) and Corollary 2.4 we get the following.

Corollary 2.7. *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a group action. It has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets S_1, S_2 if and only if for every $x \in X$, the action $G \curvearrowright G/\mathrm{Stab}_G(x)$ has a a paradoxical decomposition with these sets as translating sets.*

The following are the analogues for group actions of results of [2], proved originally for groups. Remark 2.8 is the equivalent of [2, Remark 2.2]. Theorem 2.9 follows from [2, Lemma 2.5] and [2, Theorem 2.6]. Theorem 2.10 is a reformulation of [2, Lemma 5.1].

Remark 2.8. If $G \curvearrowright X$ has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets S_1, S_2, then $G \curvearrowright X$ also has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets $S_1 g_1, S_2 g_2$ for any given $g_1, g_2 \in G$. In particular, we can always assume that $1 \in S_1, S_2$.

Theorem 2.9. *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a group action. Let S_1, S_2 be finite subsets of G. Then, the following assertions are equivalent.*

1. *$G \curvearrowright X$ has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets S_1, S_2.*
2. *For any pair of finite subsets $A_1, A_2 \subseteq X$, $|A_1 S_1^{-1} \cup A_2 S_2^{-1}| \geq |A_1| + |A_2|$.*

Theorem 2.10. *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a group action and $S = \{a, b, c\} \subseteq G$. Assume that for any finite $A \subseteq X$ we have $|AS^{-1} \cup A| \geq 2|A|$. Then $\mathcal{T}(G \curvearrowright X) \leq 6$.*

3. Schreier graphs and automata

The definitions in this section follow [1, 4, 5].

Given a free group $F = \langle x_1, x_2, \dots x_m \rangle$ and a subgroup $H \leq F$, let $\mathcal{G}$ denote the Cayley graph of the action $F \curvearrowright F/H$ with respect to the symmetric set $S = \{x_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, x_m^{\pm 1}\}$. We will refer to this graph as the Schreier graph of the subgroup H. By definition every vertex in the graph has exactly $2m$ outgoing edges, each labeled by a different element of S. For every (directed) edge e, e_- and e_+ will denote the initial and final vertex of e respectively. Note that every edge e has an inverse edge f such that $e_- = f_+, e_+ = f_-$ and the labels of e and f are inverses of each other. Sometimes we will refer to e and its inverse as a single geometric edge labeled by a letter $c^{\pm 1}$. A path in $\mathcal{G}$ is a sequence of directed edges $e_1, \dots, e_n$ where for $i < n$ the final vertex of e_i is the initial vertex of e_{i+1}. It is said to be reduced if $e_{i+1} \neq e_i^{-1}$ for all $i < n$. A cycle $e_1, \dots, e_n$ is called reduced if it is reduced as a path. That is, e_n might be equal to e_1^{-1} in a reduced cycle.

Let o be the vertex corresponding to the group H and $\mathcal{C}$ the minimal subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$ containing o and all reduced cycles from it to itself. $\mathcal{C}$ will be called the *Stallings core* of H or simply the *core* of H. Sometimes we will refer to the core as the automaton of H. Note that the elements of H are exactly those words which in reduced form can be read on a cycle in $\mathcal{C}$ from o to itself. Also, if for some reduced word $w \in F$, the coset Hw belongs to the core of H, then there exists $w' \in F$ such that ww' is reduced and $ww' \in H$. Given the core $\mathcal{C}$ of H, it is possible to construct from it the Schreier graph of H by attaching appropriate trees at each vertex of $\mathcal{C}$ with less than $2m$ outgoing edges. If such a vertex exists, the group H does not contain any normal subgroup. For this fact and further details see [1].

Given a finite number of elements $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n \in F$ there is a simple algorithm for the construction of the automaton $\mathcal{A}$ corresponding to $H = \langle p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n \rangle$. The first step consists of attaching n cycles to the origin o and labeling them by the words p_i. The second step, consists of identifying every two outgoing edges of the same vertex which have the same label, until there are no vertices with two outgoing edges labeled by the same letter. At last, vertices of degree one other than the origin are deleted. For further details, see [4]. Once $\mathcal{A}$ is given, it is possible to erase a finite number of edges and get a spanning tree T. If k edges were erased, then H is free of rank k. In particular, $k \leq n$. For this fact and further details, see [5].

Lemma 3.1. *Let $F = \langle x_1, \dots, x_m \rangle$ be a free group of rank m and $p_1, \dots, p_n \in F$.*

(1) *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the automaton corresponding to the subgroup $H = \langle p_1, \ldots, p_n \rangle$. Then, the origin o has at most $2n$ incoming edges.*
(2) *Let $K \leq H$ be a (not necessarily finitely generated) subgroup and $\mathcal{A}'$ the automaton of K. Then, the origin o' of $\mathcal{A}'$ has at most $2n$ incoming edges.*
(3) *Let $M \leq F$ be any finitely generated subgroup of infinite index and $\mathcal{B}$ the automaton corresponding to it. Then, there exists a vertex v in $\mathcal{B}$ such that v has less than $2m$ incoming edges.*

Proof. (1) Let $N = \{q_1, \ldots, q_k\}$ be a Nielsen reduced set, Nielsen equivalent to $\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$. In particular $k \leq n$ and N freely generates H. Thus, every element $w \in H$ has a unique presentation as a word in the elements of N and their inverses. Also, if q_i^ϵ for $\epsilon = \pm 1$ is the last element in the presentation of $w \in H$ then, as a word in the generators of F, the last letters of w and q_i^ϵ coincide. Thus, there are at most $2k \leq 2n$ possibilities for the last letter of a reduced word in H. In particular, the origin of $\mathcal{A}$ has at most $2n$ distinct incoming edges.

(2) If c labels an incoming edge of o' in $\mathcal{A}'$ then c^{-1} labels an outgoing edge and there is a reduced word $w = c^{-1}w'$ in K beginning with c^{-1}. Since $K \leq H$, the word $w \in H$. Thus c^{-1} labels an outgoing edge of o in $\mathcal{A}$ and c labels an incoming one. Hence the result follows from part (1).

(3) If every vertex in $\mathcal{B}$ is of degree $2m$ then $\mathcal{B}$ is the Schreier graph of the action $F \curvearrowright F/M$. Since M is finitely generated, the set of vertices of $\mathcal{B}$ is finite. Thus, M has finite index in F, a contradiction. □

Proposition 3.2. *Let $G_n = \langle x, y_1, \ldots, y_n, z \rangle$ be an $n+2$ generated free group. Then for every $p_1, \ldots, p_n \in G_n$, if $H = \gamma_2\langle p_1, \ldots, p_n \rangle$ is the derived subgroup of the group they generate, there exists $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that for all $g \in G_n$ we have $H \cap \langle x, y_j \rangle^g = \{1\}$.*

Proof. By induction on n. For $n = 1$ for every $p_1 \in G_1$ the group $H = \{1\}$ and the proposition holds. Assume the proposition holds for n but not for $n+1$. Let $p_1, \ldots, p_{n+1} \in G_{n+1}$ be elements for which the proposition fails. In particular, for $j = n+1$ there exists $g \in G_{n+1}$ and a non trivial word $u(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \in \gamma_2\langle x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1} \rangle$, where $\langle x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1} \rangle$ is a free group of rank $n+1$, such that substituting p_i for x_i gives a non trivial element $u = u(p_1, \ldots, p_{n+1}) \in \gamma_2\langle p_1, \ldots, p_{n+1} \rangle \cap \langle x, y_{n+1} \rangle^g$.

Let $\pi \colon G_{n+1} \to G_n$ be the homomorphism taking y_{n+1} to 1 and any other generator of G_{n+1} to its copy in G_n. Then $\pi(u) \in \langle x \rangle^{\pi(g)}$. Since $\pi(u) = \pi(u(p_1, \ldots, p_{n+1})) = u(\pi(p_1), \ldots, \pi(p_{n+1})) \in \gamma_2 G_n$ we have $\pi(u) = 1$. Indeed the intersection $\gamma_2 G_n \cap \langle x \rangle^{\pi(g)}$ is trivial. Since $u(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1})$ is a non trivial word, $\pi(p_1), \ldots, \pi(p_{n+1})$ are not free generators of the group K they generate. In particular, if K is free of rank r then $r \leq n$. Let $\{q_1, \ldots, q_n\} \subseteq G_n$ be an n element subset which generates K. The following claim yields the required contradiction.

Claim 3.3. *The conclusion of Proposition 3.2 does not hold for G_n with the elements $q_1, \ldots, q_n$.*

Proof. Otherwise, for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and every $a \in G_n$ we have $\gamma_2\langle q_1, \ldots, q_n \rangle \cap \langle x, y_j \rangle^a = \{1\}$. By assumption, there exists $b \in G_{n+1}$ and a non trivial element $v \in \gamma_2\langle p_1, \ldots, p_{n+1} \rangle \cap \langle x, y_j \rangle^b$. In particular, $v = b^{-1}wb$ for a non trivial word $w \in \langle x, y_j \rangle$. Let $v' = \pi(v)$, then $v' = \pi(b)^{-1}w\pi(b)$ where we now consider the word w as an element of G_n. Note that as a word in the letters $x^{\pm 1}, y_j^{\pm 1}$, the reduced form of w is not affected by the homomorphism π. Therefore, since w is not trivial, $v' \neq 1$. On the other hand,

$v' \in \gamma_2\langle \pi(p_1), \dots, \pi(p_{n+1})\rangle = \gamma_2\langle q_1, \dots, q_n\rangle$. Therefore $\gamma_2\langle q_1, \dots, q_n\rangle \cap \langle x, y_j\rangle^{\pi(b)}$ is not trivial. A contradiction. □

□

Corollary 3.4. *Let $G_n = \langle x, y_1, \dots, y_n, z\rangle$ be a free group of rank $n+2$ and $p_1, \dots, p_n \in G_n$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the automaton corresponding to the subgroup $H = \gamma_2\langle p_1, \dots, p_n\rangle$. Then there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that there are no reduced non trivial cycles in $\mathcal{A}$ labeled by elements of $\langle x, y_j\rangle$.*

Proof. Let $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ be an index for which the conclusion of Proposition 3.2 is satisfied. Assume by contradiction that s is a reduced non trivial cycle in $\mathcal{A}$ labeled by a word in $\langle x, y_j\rangle$ and let v be the initial (and final) vertex of s. There exists $g \in G$ such that v represents the coset Hg. Thus, if w is the label of s, $Hgw = Hg$ implies that $w \in H^g \cap \langle x, y_j\rangle$. Then $w^{g^{-1}} \in H \cap \langle x, y_j\rangle^{g^{-1}}$ is a non trivial element, a contradiction. □

4. Construction of group actions with a given Tarski number

In this section we prove Theorem 1. Let $F = G_n = \langle x, y_1, \dots, y_n, z\rangle$ be an $n+2$ generated free group for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We will construct a subgroup H for which the action $F \curvearrowright F/H$ is faithful and has Tarski number $n+3$. H will be defined by means of its core.

Let $(p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n})_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an enumeration of all the n-tuples of elements of G_n. For each i let $\mathcal{A}_i$ be the automaton representing the subgroup $K_i = \gamma_2\langle p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n}\rangle$ and let o_i be its origin. By Lemma 3.1, o_i has at most $2n$ incoming edges. Thus, there exists a letter $c_i \notin \{z, z^{-1}\}$ different than the labels of all incoming edges of o_i.

We define the core $\mathcal{C}$ of H in the following way (for an illustration, see Figure 1). Let o be the origin of $\mathcal{C}$ and $e_1, e_2, \dots$ an infinite sequence of edges, all labeled by z, such that $e_{1-} = o$ and for all i we have $e_{i+} = e_{i+1-}$. Since the letters $c_i \notin \{z, z^{-1}\}$, for each i it is possible to attach to e_{i+} an outgoing edge labeled by c_i. To its head vertex one can attach the automaton $\mathcal{A}_i$ by identifying o_i with the vertex in question. Indeed, the choice of letters c_i guarantees that no cancellation occurs in $\mathcal{C}$.

Clearly, if H is the group represented by $\mathcal{C}$, then $H = \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \gamma_2\langle p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n}\rangle^{(z^i c_i)^{-1}}$. By construction, the origin o has degree 1 in $\mathcal{C}$. In particular, there are vertices in $\mathcal{C}$ of degree smaller than $2(n+2)$ and H does not contain any normal subgroup [1].



Figure 1. The core of H

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the Schreier graph of the action $F \curvearrowright F/H$. The graph $\mathcal{G}$ can be obtained from $\mathcal{C}$ by attaching trees to every vertex of $\mathcal{C}$ of degree less than $2(n+2)$. The action $F \curvearrowright F/H$ can be described in terms of the action of F on the graph $\mathcal{G}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let v be a vertex in $\mathcal{G}$. There is at most one automaton $\mathcal{A}_m$ to which one can get from v via a path whose label does not include the letter $z^{\pm 1}$.*

Proof. Clearly, there is no path between two different automata $\mathcal{A}_l$ and $\mathcal{A}_r$ which does not cross an edge labeled by $z^{\pm 1}$. Assume that t_1, t_2 are paths from v to two distinct automata $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{A}_\beta$, such that both t_1 and t_2 do not cross any edge labeled by $z^{\pm 1}$. Then the path $t_1^{-1}t_2$ connects $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{A}_\beta$ and does not contain the letter $z^{\pm 1}$. □

Let $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be a partition of the set of automata $\{\mathcal{A}_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $\mathcal{A}_i \in X_j$ if and only if j is the smallest index which satisfies the conclusion of Corollary 3.4 for the automaton $\mathcal{A}_i$. By Lemma 4.1, for each vertex v of $\mathcal{G}$ there exists at most one automaton to which it is possible to get via a path not including the letter $z^{\pm 1}$. Thus, it is possible define a partition of the vertex set of $\mathcal{G}$ to n sets $\{Y_j\}_{j=1}^n$ in the following way. For a vertex v, if $\mathcal{A}_m$ is an automaton reachable from v via a path not containing the letter $z^{\pm 1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_m$ belongs to X_j for some j, then v will belong to Y_j for the same j. If no automaton is reachable from v via such a path, v will belong in Y_1. Note, that each of the sets in the partition is closed under the action of $\langle x, y_1, \ldots, y_n\rangle$.

Lemma 4.2. *For $j = 1, \ldots, n$ the group $\langle x, y_j\rangle$ acts freely on Y_j.*

Proof. Let $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and v be a vertex of Y_j. Assume by contradiction that $w \in \langle x, y_j\rangle$ is a reduced non trivial word stabilizing v. Then w labels a reduced non trivial cycle s from v to itself in $\mathcal{G}$. Since s is non trivial, it must contain as a subpath a reduced non trivial cycle s' through some automaton $\mathcal{A}_m$. Note that $\mathcal{A}_m$ is reachable from v via a subpath of s, which by definition does not contain the letter $z^{\pm 1}$. Therefore, $v \in Y_j$ implies that $\mathcal{A}_m$ contains no reduced non trivial cycle labeled by a word in $\langle x, y_j\rangle$, a contradiction. □

Lemma 4.3. *The Tarski number of the action of F on $\mathcal{G}$ is at least $n+3$.*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that the action has Tarski number at most $n+2$ and let S_1, S_2 be translating sets of a paradoxical decomposition with $|S_1| + |S_2| \leq n+2$. By Remark 2.8, we can assume that $1 \in S_1 \cap S_2$. Then, $S = (S_1 \cup S_2) \setminus \{1\}$ is a set of n elements at most. Let K be the subgroup it generates. Then $K \curvearrowright \mathcal{G}$ has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets S_1, S_2. Let $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ be the elements of S (possibly with repetitions) and assume the n-tuple $(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ was enumerated as tuple number m. Let o_m be the origin of the automaton $\mathcal{A}_m$. By Corollary 2.7, $K \curvearrowright K/\mathrm{Stab}_K(o_m)$ has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets S_1, S_2. Since $\gamma_2(K) \subseteq \mathrm{Stab}_K(o_m)$, Lemma 2.3(2) implies that the same is true for the action $K \curvearrowright K/\gamma_2(K)$. In particular, this action is paradoxical. By Remark 2.5, the group $K/\gamma_2(K)$ is paradoxical, in contradiction to it being abelian. □

Lemma 4.4. *Let $F' = \langle x, y_1, \ldots, y_n\rangle$. Then $F' \curvearrowright \mathcal{G}$ has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets $S_1 = \{1, x\}$, $S_2 = \{1, y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$. In particular, $\mathcal{T}(F' \curvearrowright \mathcal{G}) \leq n+3$.*

Proof. $\mathcal{G}$ is the disjoint union of the sets Y_j for $j = 1, \ldots, n$ where each of the sets is closed under the action of F'. By Lemma 4.2, for each j, the action of $\langle x, y_j\rangle$ on Y_j is free. Thus by Corollary 2.2, Y_j has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets $\{1, x\}$ and $\{1, y_j\}$. By adding empty sets to the decomposition, we get that every Y_j has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets S_1 and S_2. Thus Lemma 2.6(1) yields the result. □

By Lemma 2.3(1), $\mathcal{T}(F \curvearrowright \mathcal{G}) \leq \mathcal{T}(F' \curvearrowright \mathcal{G}) \leq n+3$. Thus, by Lemma 4.3,

$$\mathcal{T}(F \curvearrowright F/H) = \mathcal{T}(F \curvearrowright \mathcal{G}) = n+3.$$

□

Remark 4.5. For every $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k+l = n+1$ it is possible to rename the first $n+1$ generators $x, y_1, \dots y_n$ of $F = G_n$ by $x_1, \dots, x_k$, $y_1, \dots, y_l$. Then, for the subgroup H constructed above, $F \curvearrowright F/H$ has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets $S_1 = \{1, x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $S_2 = \{1, y_1, \dots, y_l\}$. Indeed, the only necessary change is to Proposition 3.2.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $G_{k,l} = \langle x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_l, z\rangle$ be a $k+l+1$ generated free group. Then for every $p_1, \dots, p_{k+l-1} \in G_{k,l}$, if $H = \gamma_2\langle p_1, \dots, p_{k+l-1}\rangle$ is the derived subgroup of the group they generate, there exist $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ such that for all $g \in G_{k,l}$ we have $H \cap \langle x_i, y_j\rangle^g = \{1\}$.*

Proof. By induction on k. The case $k = 1$ is Proposition 3.2. Assume the proposition holds for k (and every l) but not for $k+1$. Then there exists $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the proposition fails for $G_{k+1,l}$. The reduction to the case $G_{k,l}$ follows the same argument as that in Proposition 3.2. Here the homomorphism $\pi\colon G_{k+1,l} \to G_{k,l}$ maps x_{k+1} to the identity and any other generator to its copy. □

Corollary 4.7. *Let $k \geq 4$. There exists a finitely generated free group F and a faithful transitive group action $F \curvearrowright X$, such that $\mathcal{T}(F \curvearrowright X) = k$ and for all $m, n \geq 2$ such that $m+n = k$ the action $F \curvearrowright X$ has a paradoxical decomposition with translating sets S_1, S_2 such that $|S_1| = m$ and $|S_2| = n$.*

Note that nothing similar is known for groups. Indeed, we don't have an example of a group with Tarski number k which has two paradoxical decompositions, one with translating sets of size m_1 and n_1 and the other with translating sets of size m_2 and n_2, such that for $i = 1, 2$ we have $m_i + n_i = k$ and $\{m_1, n_1\} \neq \{m_2, n_2\}$.

5. Unbounded Tarski numbers

In what follows, p will be a fixed prime number. Let F be a finitely generated non abelian free group. Let $\{\omega_n F\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the *Zassenhaus p-filtration* of F defined by $\omega_n F = \prod_{i\cdot p^j \geq n} (\gamma_i F)^{p^j}$. It is easy to see that $\{\omega_n F\}$ is a descending chain of normal subgroups of p-power index in F. Moreover, $\{\omega_n F\}$ is a base for the pro-p topology on F, so in particular, F being residually-p implies that $\cap \omega_n F = \{1\}$. It follows that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $m(n) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the reduced form of any element of $\omega_{m(n)} F$ is of length $\geq 12n$. Clearly, the index $[F : \omega_{m(n)} F] > n$. Thus, by the Schreier index formula, $\omega_{m(n)} F$ is free of rank $> n$. In particular, every n elements $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \omega_{m(n)} F$ generate a subgroup of infinite index inside $\omega_{m(n)} F$ and thus inside F.

Theorem 2 is a straightforward corollary of the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $F = \langle x, y, z\rangle$ and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $m(n)$ be as described above. There exists $H \leq F$ with the following properties.*

1. *H does not contain a non trivial normal subgroup of F.*
2. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{T}(\omega_{m(n)} F \curvearrowright F/H) \geq n+3$.*
3. *$\mathcal{T}(F \curvearrowright F/H) = 6$.*

Proof. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n})_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an enumeration of the elements of $\omega_{m(n)}F$. For each $n, i \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\mathcal{A}_{(n,i)}$ be the automaton corresponding to the subgroup generated by the elements of the n-tuple $(p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,n})$. By Lemma 3.1(3) there exists a vertex $o'_{(n,i)}$ in $\mathcal{A}_{(n,i)}$ with less than 6 incoming edges. Let $c_{(n,i)}$ be a letter distinct from the labels of all the incoming edges of $o'_{(n,i)}$. Let $\alpha(k)$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ be an enumeration of all the pairs $(n, i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$.

The construction of the core $\mathcal{C}$ of H will be similar to the construction used in section 4. Let o be the origin of $\mathcal{C}$ and $e_1, e_2, \dots$ be an infinite sequence of edges such that $e_{1-} = o$ and for all k we have $e_{k+} = e_{k+1-}$. It is possible to label the edges e_k inductively such that if $l(e_k)$ is the label of e_k, then $l(e_1) \neq c^{-1}_{\alpha(1)}$ and for each $k > 1$, the label $l(e_k) \notin \{l(e_{k-1})^{-1}, c_{\alpha(k-1)}, c^{-1}_{\alpha(k)}\}$. The choice of the labels of e_k means that for all k, one can attach to e_{k+} an outgoing edge labeled by $c_{\alpha(k)}$. To its head vertex, it is possible to attach the automaton $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha(k)}$ by identifying $o'_{\alpha(k)}$ with the vertex in question. Indeed, the choice of letters $c_{\alpha(k)}$ guarantees than no cancellation occurs in $\mathcal{C}$. Denote by $\mathcal{G}$ the Schreier graph of the group H represented by $\mathcal{C}$.

Lemma 5.2. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\mathcal{T}(\omega_{m(n)}F \curvearrowright \mathcal{G}) \geq n + 3$.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Lemma 4.3. If K is an n-generated subgroup of $\omega_{m(n)}F$, it fixes a point of $\mathcal{G}$. In particular, the action $K \curvearrowright \mathcal{G}$ is not paradoxical. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \omega_{m(n)}F$ and $\mathcal{A}$ be the automaton corresponding to the group K they generate as a subgroup of F.*

1. *There exists a spanning tree T in $\mathcal{A}$ such that every vertex in $\mathcal{A}$ loses at most one of the edges adjacent to it in the transition from $\mathcal{A}$ to T.*
2. *$\mathcal{A}$ does not contain loops.*

Proof. (1) As mentioned in the introduction, in order to construct a spanning tree of $\mathcal{A}$ we have to erase at most n edges from $\mathcal{A}$. Assume i edges, $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, were already erased and no two of them are adjacent to the same vertex. If the resulting graph is a tree, we are done. Otherwise, let e be an edge whose removal would not affect the connectivity of the graph. Let v be its initial vertex and s a reduced cycle from v to itself which starts with the edge e and does not visit any vertex other than v twice. Then, the removal of any edge of s would not affect the connectivity of $\mathcal{A}$. If v corresponds to the coset Kg and w is the label of the cycle s, then $w \in K^g \subseteq \omega_{m(n)}F$. As such, the length of w, and of the cycle s, is at least $12n$. Until now, at most $n - 1$ edges have been erased. Each of them is adjacent to at most 2 vertices. Each of the $2(n - 1)$ vertices in question is adjacent to at most 6 edges. Thus there are at most $12(n - 1)$ edges adjacent to vertices which have already lost an edge. As such, at least one edge on the cycle s is not one of these edges and one can erase it to complete the induction.

(2) As demonstrated in the proof of part (1), all reduced non trivial cycles of $\mathcal{A}$ are of length $\geq 12n$. □

Lemma 5.4. *Let $S = \{x, y, z\}$. Then for any finite set A of vertices of $\mathcal{G}$, we have $|AS^{-1} \cup A| \geq 2|A|$. In particular, by Theorem 2.10, $\mathcal{T}(F \curvearrowright \mathcal{G}) \leq 6$.*

Proof. From each of the automata $\mathcal{A}_{(n,i)}$ attached during the construction of the core $\mathcal{C}$, it is possible to erase at most n edges such that the resulting spanning tree of the automata satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 5.3(1). Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the graph obtained in this way from the graph $\mathcal{G}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{T}$ is a tree. Lemma 5.3(2) implies that there are no loops in $\mathcal{G}$.

Thus, every vertex in $\mathcal{G}$ is adjacent to 6 distinct unoriented edges. The choice of the tree $\mathcal{T}$ implies that each vertex in $\mathcal{T}$ is adjacent to at least 5 edges. Thus, considering orientation, every vertex of $\mathcal{T}$ has at least two incoming edges labeled by elements of S.

Let A be a finite set of vertices of $\mathcal{G}$. Let E be the set of all oriented edges $e = (as^{-1}, a)$ such that $a \in A$, $s \in S$ and the unoriented edge $\{as^{-1}, a\}$ lies in $\mathcal{T}$. From the above, E contains at least $2|A|$ edges and no pair of opposite ones. The endpoints of edges in E lie in the set $A \cup AS^{-1}$. Let Λ be the unoriented graph with vertex set $A \cup AS^{-1}$ and edge set E (with forgotten orientation). Then Λ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{T}$; in particular Λ is a (finite) forest. Hence, if $V(\Lambda)$ and $E(\Lambda)$ denote the sets of vertices and edges of Λ, respectively, then

$$|A \cup AS^{-1}| = |V(\Lambda)| > |E(\Lambda)| = |E| \geq 2|A|,$$

as desired. □

Lemma 5.5. $\mathcal{T}(F \curvearrowright \mathcal{G}) = 6$.

Proof. By contradiction, let $S_1 = \{1, a\}, S_2 = \{1, b, c\}$ (possibly with b=c) be translating sets of a paradoxical decomposition of $F \curvearrowright \mathcal{G}$. For $r = p^{m(3)}$, let $p_1 = a^r, p_2 = (a^b)^r$ and $p_3 = (a^c)^r$. Then $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in \omega_{m(3)}F$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the automaton corresponding to the group K generated by p_1, p_2, p_3 and $o_{\mathcal{A}}$ its origin. $\mathcal{A}$ is attached to the core of H by some vertex of $\mathcal{A}$. Let A_1, A_2 be finite sets of vertices of $\mathcal{G}$ defined as follows. $A_1 = o_{\mathcal{A}} \cdot \{a^j, b^{-1}a^j, c^{-1}a^j : 0 \leq j \leq r-1\}$ and $A_2 = \{o_{\mathcal{A}}\}$. A simple calculation shows that $A_1 S_1^{-1} = A_1\{1, a^{-1}\} = A_1$ (for a visual illustration, see Figure 2). Clearly, $A_2 S_2^{-1} \subseteq A_1$. Thus,

$$|A_1 S_1^{-1} \cup A_2 S_2^{-1}| = |A_1| < |A_1| + |A_2|,$$

by contradiction to the implication (1) ⇒ (2) of Theorem 2.9.



FIGURE 2. The automaton $\mathcal{A}$. The set A_1 is the set of all the vertices in the figure.

□

□

REFERENCES

[1] Y. Bahturin and A. Olshanskii, *Actions of maximal growth* Proc. London Math. Soc. 101 (2010), no. 1, 27–72.
[2] M. Ershov, G. Golan and M. Sapir, *The Tarski numbers of groups,* http://arxiv.org/abs/1401.2202.
[3] M. Ershov and A. Jaikin-Zapirain, *Groups of positive weighted deficiency,* J. Reine Angew. Math. 677 (2013), no. 677, 71–134.

[4] S. Margolis, M. Sapir and P. Weil, *Closed subgroups in pro-V topologies and the extension problem for inverse automata* International Journal of Algebra and Computation, 11 (2001), no. 4, 405–455.
[5] A. Olshanskii, *Subnormal subgroups in free groups, their growth and cogrowth,* http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.0129.
[6] N. Ozawa and M. Sapir, *Non-amenable groups with arbitrarily large Tarski number?,* mathoverflow question 137678.
[7] M. Sapir, *Combinatorial algebra: syntax and semantics*, http://www.math.vanderbilt.edu/∼msapir/book/b2.pdf.
[8] S. Wagon, *The Banach-Tarski paradox,* Cambridge University Press, (1985).

Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan 5290002, Israel
E-mail address: gili.golan@math.biu.ac.il